

REMARKS

The Office Action of March 29, 2007 has been received and its contents carefully considered.

Turning first to the objection to the specification, in section 2 of the Office Action, the present Amendment revises the claims so that they now refer to an “e-commerce system” rather than a “payment system.” It is respectfully submitted that this revision overcomes the objection.

Section 4 of the Office Action rejects claim 2 under the first paragraph of 35 USC 112, on the ground that it “contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.” This is a new matter rejection, and it is respectfully traversed. Claim 2 was part of the original disclosure, so it cannot be new matter. It is noted, however, that the present Amendment revises the specification so as to incorporate the disclosure in claim 2 into the specification.

Sections 6-8 reject the claims for indefiniteness. In response, the present Amendment replaces claim 1 with the new independent claim 22, and revises the remaining claims to improve their form under US claim-drafting practice. As presently formulated, the claims are clearly directed to a relay server, but a relay server for use in an e-commerce system. That is, the environment in which the relay server of the claims is used is an e-commerce system, and in order for the claims to adequately define the relay server that is being claimed it is necessary for the claims to also specify features of this environment. It is respectfully submitted that the claims, as currently formulated, are suitably definite under the second paragraph of 35 USC 112.

In addition to improvements of a formal nature that have been made in the claims, the present Amendment also cancels claim 4 and transfers most of its subject matter to independent claim 22. The present Amendment adds a new dependent claim 23 for part of the subject matter of claim 4 (“wherein ... the summarized information that is produced by the contents converting section is based on the receiving capability of the

user terminal”). New claim 23 is supported by the passage at page 13 of the application, lines 22-24, and by the disclosure in claim 4 (now cancelled).

Section 10 of the Office Action rejects the claims for obviousness on the basis of Kerkdijk and Vazvan. For the reasons discussed below, however, it is respectfully submitted that the invention defined by independent claim 22 is patentable over these references.

Kerkdijk reference discloses an e-commerce system that includes a customer agent (CA) 13, which communicates with a customer’s browser. Figure 2 of the reference illustrates a transaction, which the reference explains as follows (in the passage at column 3, line 64 to column 4, line 10):

In step I, the CA 13 requests the Merchant Agent (MA) 14 to pay by credit card. The latter then informs the merchant server 3 of the requested payment, while parallel to that the CA 13 initialises the EW 10.

In step II, the standard SET procedure is performed by the EW 10, the Merchant server 3 and the Payment Gateway server 5.

Finally, in step III, after completion of the payment, the Merchant server 3 informs the MA 14 of this fact. The MA 14 passes this message on to the CA 13, which notifies the customer of payment completion.

Claim 22 now recites, (in addition to a “redirecting section,” “a contents converting section that receives third information from the wallet server, selects at least one predetermined information item out of the third information to produce summarized information, and transmits the summarized information to the user terminal, the third information including information about the payment processing procedure.” It is respectfully submitted that Kerkdijk neither discloses nor suggests a contents converting section that transmits summarized information to the user.

The Office Action acknowledges that Kerkdijk fails to disclose that the user terminal comprises a portable cellular phone, and turns to the Vazvan reference for this. However, the Vazvan reference, like the Kerkdijk reference, fails to disclose or suggest the “contents converting section” of independent claim 22.

The remaining claims depend from claim 22 and recite additional limitations to further define the invention. They are therefore automatically patentable along with claim 22 and need not be further discussed.

For the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the application is therefore respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Allen Wood". The signature is written in dark ink and is positioned above a horizontal line.

Allen Wood
Registration No. 28,134
Customer No. 23995
Rabin & Berdo, P.C.
(202) 371-8976 (telephone)
(202) 408-0924 (facsimile)

AW/ng